

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action dated February 20, 2003, the Examiner first indicated that the specification as filed allegedly fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter set forth in Claim 1 as "a control mechanism" and a "mechanism" as set forth in Claim 1, lines 6 and 9, respectively, and further, that the specification describes a plurality of "mechanism".

In response, the applicant submits that the control mechanism is referred to and described in the specification in at least the passage at page 5, lines 26-32, to wit:

As shown in Figure 2, a base card 20 includes a first or main card 50 housing the core processing unit, I/O, and memory. For example the main card 50 includes a CPU 55, such as a Cirrus Logic CL-EP7211, which is a single-chip embedded controller functioning as a CPU for ultra-low-power applications, and armed with processing and enhanced memory management features...

and with respect to the drawing Figure 3, in the specification at page 10, lines 6-9, to wit:

A client-server graphics subsystem 230, storage subsystem manager 240 and synchronization sub-system manager 250 is provided on top of the device drivers for receiving and transmitting I/O events between the applications..

and, in the specification at page 11, lines 18-21, to wit:

...the synchronization manager 250 is provided to synchronize data transfer between the Personal pointer device and the other devices..

Applicant respectfully submits that each of these passages describes aspects of a control mechanism used for controlling transfer of information between devices. Furthermore, the

stated element in Claim 1 "mechanism for interfacing" is described in at least the passage in the specification describing Figure 1 at page 4, lines 27-29, to wit:

..an interface 14 for transmitting signals from the mouse device to an attached computer device..

Thus, in light of this rejection, it is respectfully submitted that proper antecedent basis is provided for these "mechanism" recitations.

With respect to the Examiner's objection to the specification and the following limitations therein: "mechanism in the second device" (at page 2, lines 21, et seq.), "data transfer mechanism" and "a roller wheel mechanism", the Examiner has made it a requirement to provide the required descriptions for the above-claimed limitations. Respectfully, none of these recitations currently appear in any of the rejected claims. However, in compliance with the Examiner's request, applicants hereby amend the specification at page 2, lines 21-233 of the specification in the manner to remove reference to the phrase "mechanism in the second device". Particularly, the passage in the specification at page 2, lines 21-page 3, line 3 has been amended to conform in substance and form with previous amendments to Claim 1 submitted in responses to previously issued Office Actions of March 13, 2002 and September 11, 2002.

With respect to the limitation of the "data transfer mechanism" the definition is found at page 7 lines 22-30 in connection with the discussion of wired or wireless interface functionality provided by Asynchronous Receiver Transmitter (UART) devices. Particularly the "data transfer mechanism" is defined as an equivalent means to one of a first Universal Asynchronous Receiver Transmitter (UART1) device for supporting either the RF-modem 76 or Bluetooth 81 communications functionality or, a second UART device (UART2) providing

support for data download functionality, e.g., from a PC or network server. Respectfully, the above-referenced passage states:

...It is understood that any like data transfer mechanism or data exchange interface device may be implemented to provide data download and RF communications support functionality. (emphasis added)

With respect to the limitation of a "a roller wheel mechanism" a definition is provided in the present specification at page 8, lines 14-21 where it is stated:

The roller wheel mechanism 95 may be rolled up or down (i.e., clockwise or anticlockwise) to simulate a display cursor scrolling function for text and graphics, and specifically generates signals that are A/D converted for receipt by the processor to enable movement of the Personal pointer device display cursor, and more particularly, movement of an arrow cursor or other displayed indicators providing appointment update and browsing functions.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the objections to the specification.

Further in the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as providing a variety of terms meaning the same thing, which the Examiner found confusing. For instance the Examiner objected to the use of corresponding similar phrases:

"personalized user preferences" vs. "personalize data", "first computer device" vs. "a first computing device" and a "second computer device" vs. "a second computing device".

All of these limitations are found in the claims and applicant hereby takes this opportunity to amend the claims to provide consistent language for these phrases. For instance, Claim 1 is being amended to set forth first and second computing devices, as are amended Claims 3 and 5 likewise amended, and Claims 16 and 22 are being amended to set forth personalized user

preferences as are amended Claims 7 and 15. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the objection to the specification.

Further in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s) at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that the claim limitation "a control mechanism" is not described in the specification.

Applicant respectfully traverses in view of the discussion hereinabove regarding the objections to the specification. Further to that discussion, applicant submits that the claimed control mechanism is further implemented in software on the first and second computing devices that are programmed in accordance with the flow charts of Figures 4(a)-4(c) and, described generally in the specification, as amended, on page 11, lines 20-30, to wit:

...the user device from which data is to be transferred is provided with software executable as part of a control mechanism for initiating transfer of selected personalized data such as preferences and customizations associated with the user, i.e., from the user device, e.g., that user's personal Windows® desktop to the personal pointer device. In an alternate embodiment, a user may initiate the transfer from the personal pointer device itself. For example, a user may have set some preferences in Microsoft Power-point, or even a Netscape browser, and even may have specially created icons which are sorted to the user's smart mouse for subsequent transmission to another device when the user does not have access to his/her own PC. This may be accomplished by a wireless communication or cabling 14...(as amended)

In one embodiment, for example, the computing devices may automatically detect the smart pointer device on connection as shown in Figures 4(a) and 4(c) or, rather may be initiated with specific commands. Automatic detection is preferred, for example, as it may be better for the user instead of having to launch commands.

Respectfully, it is submitted that no new matter is being entered by the amendment to the specification as full support is found in the drawings and claims as originally filed.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the applicant hereby amends claim 3 to remove language directed to a mechanism for removing and a mechanism for restoring, as these are functions within the purview of the software control mechanism as respectfully described in Figures 4(a)–4(c) and the supporting description in the specification, e.g., page 13, line 30 to page 15, line 5. Specifically, Claim 3 is being amended to set forth that the second computing device retains the original user application preferences currently existing in the second computing device prior to altering said user application with said user customized aspects, and restores the original user application preferences for the user application after disconnecting said pointer device from said second device. Respectfully, clear support is found in the specification as a skilled artisan would be able to implement software in the second computer device for performing the original user application preferences retention and restoration functions.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the applicant hereby cancels Claims 12 and 13.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the applicant hereby amends Claim 15 to remove language directed to a mechanism for recognizing as these are functions within the purview of the software control mechanism as respectfully described in the specification at page 14, lines 14–21 in connection with in Figure 4(b) at step 515. Specifically, Claim 15 is being amended to set forth that the control

mechanism recognizes a like application being executed on said second computing device and automatically initiates said transfer of personalized user preferences.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 3, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Further in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In this rejection, the Examiner again takes issue with the recitation of "a control mechanism" of Claim 1, however, additionally cites instances of various informalities in the Claims 3, 5-9, 10, 12, 17-18, 21, 23-24 and 27. Respectfully, each of the informalities cited by the Examiner in the Office Action have been addressed. For instance, the alleged lack of antecedent basis for limitation "second device" and "personalized data" in these claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 17-18, 21, 23-24 and 27 have been addressed to now recite "second computing device" and "personalized user preferences." Care has been taken to ensure that no new matter has been entered by recitation of these phrases in each of these amended claims.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of Claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 17-18, 21, 23-24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Finally, in the Office Action, the Examiner requested that a clear description of the control mechanism be provided in the specification. In response, as discussed above, applicants have amended the specification at page 11, lines 20-30 in support of Figures 4(a)-4(c) to provide clear support in the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being entered by this amendment to the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims and specification made herein obviate the objections and rejections of the specification and the claims and accordingly request that the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks herein, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman  
Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

SF:gc